

Remarks

Claims 1-6 are pending.

Claims 7-9 are withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the 8-21-06 Office Action, Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Licata (US 3,735,020). Grounds for the rejection were maintained from the 4-5-06 Office Action.

Claims 1-3

In the 8-21-06 Office Action, the amendments to claims 1-3 were not considered, because the Examiner asserted that the amendments introduced new matter. In fact, no new matter was added in the amendments. Since the amendments for claims 1-3 did not introduce new matter, applicant respectfully requests that the final rejection be withdrawn and that claim 1-3 be examined against the prior art of record in light of arguments made in the response filed June 5, 2006. Evidence that no new matter was added follows:

Claim 1

The limitation of “T-shaped channels” as recited in claim 1 can be clearly seen in Fig. 2A as reference character 25. The “T-shaped channels” (25) can also be seen in Figs. 4, 5A, 6A, and 7.

Claim 2

The limitation of “parallel to a plane of the at least one of said contact faces” as recited in claim 2 can be seen in Fig. 2A, the plane being reference character 13.

Claim 3

The limitation where “the bridge has a thickness that is less than that of said at least two face plates” as recited in claim 3 can be seen in Figs. 1, 2A, and 2B, the bridge having reference character 125 and the face plates having reference character 10. Figs. 5A,B also clearly show

the bridge (125) with a thickness less than the face plates (10).

Claim 4

Fig. 17 of Licata shows a groove (100) and fins (90, 91). However, the fins disclosed by Licata must be long enough for the grooved surfaces (94, 95) to receive screw members (col. 6, lines 18-22). Because of the minimum required length of the fins (90, 91), the fins (90, 91) touch each other before opposite surfaces of the groove (100) touch each other. Thus, the opposite surfaces of the groove (100) cannot constitute levering faces as recited in claim 4. To shorten the fin (90, 91) length of Licata in order for the opposite surfaces of the groove (100) touch each other would render the screw-receiving grooved surfaces (94, 95) inoperable.

In contrast, Figs. 6B and 6A of the current Application clearly show how angling the face plates (10) with respect to each other causes the bridge (125) bend, which causes the levering faces (126) to contact each other. Further application of force on the face plates (10) exerts a levered force on the bridge (125), which causes the bridge to break. This action is described in the current Application on page 9, lines 6-23. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the 8-21-06 Office Action, Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmitt et al. (US 6,278,606).

Claim 1

Schmitt, like Licata, fails to disclose “T-shaped channels,” as recited in claim 1. The “T-shaped channels” of claim 1 as amended in the 6-5-06 response are not new matter (see above). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends on independent claim 1, which is allowable. Therefore, claim 5 is also allowable.

Conclusion

Examination of the Application should now be able to proceed.

Very respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kenneth M. Benderly', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kenneth M. Benderly
AGENT
Reg. No. 51,453
2345 Yale Street, 2nd Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
main: (650) 424-0100
direct: (650) 331-8415